

## **REMARKS**

The present Response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection being raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt and favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application.

Claim 7 was previously cancelled.

### **Remarks to Claim Rejections**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112***

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

For example, the Office Action alleges that by citing in claim 1 “said first logic means to be presented on a dedicated bus”, it is unclear how the logic means is presented. Applicants would like to point out that this distinctive claim element is about where, which is on a dedicated bus, the first logic means is presented and not about how the logic means is presented. Nevertheless in order to advance prosecution of the present application, Applicants propose, if the Examiner agrees, to amend this particular claim element to read as “said first logic means being presented on a dedicated bus” for clarity purpose.

Further for example, the Office Action alleges that by citing in claim 1 “and configured to store a valid task being presented to all of said storage fields in parallel on said dedicated bus”, it is unclear whether the task is being stored on the dedicated bus or

in the storage fields. Applicants would like to point out that a person skilled in the art will easily recognize that the task is presented in parallel on the dedicated bus and stored in the storage fields. It is well known in the art that a bus, or a dedicated bus, is not a storage device and therefore cannot be used for storing tasks. Nevertheless in order to advance prosecution of the present application, Applicants propose, if the Examiner agrees, to amend this particular claim element to read as “and configured to store a valid task, being presented in parallel on said dedicated bus, to all of said storage fields”.

In view of above, Applicants respectfully request rejections of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103***

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Diem et al. (US 5,596,540, “Diem”).

Applicants respectfully disagree.

According to MPEP 2142, in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Applicants assert that the background description of present application (the alleged AAPA), in combination with prior art reference Diem, fails to reach the threshold as set forth by MPEP 2142 in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against independent claim 1 as being discussed below in details.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action alleges that AAPA teaches, at [0004] lines 3-9, a first logic means for enabling valid tasks and for inhibiting others, to be presented on a dedicated bus. Applicants respectfully disagree. Paragraph [0004] lines 3-9 describes that conventional controllers are based on a FIFO memory using a totally serial process because the tasks are loaded into the FIFO memory one after another, and therefore the conventional controllers are not adapted for fast processing. However, Applicants were not able to find any evidence supporting the alleged teaching of a first logic means for “inhibiting others”, “to be presented on a dedicated bus”, or even the existence of “a dedicated bus” in paragraph [0004] lines 3-9 of the alleged AAPA.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action further alleges that AAPA teaches a task management circuit and the task management circuit includes a FIFO memory connected to the dedicated bus. Applicants would like to point out that, in addition to the deficiency of “a dedicated bus” as discussed above, AAPA does not teach, suggest, or imply a FIFO memory that is connected to a dedicated bus, which is missing, nor a task management circuit that is coupled to the first logic means.

The Office Action admits that AAPA does not teach that the FIFO memory is configured to store a valid task being presented to all of said storage fields in parallel on said dedicated bus, but alleges that it would have been obvious to combine AAPA with prior art reference Diem, which the Office Action alleges teaching a method of writing and reading data out of a FIFO memory in a parallel manner. Applicants would like to point out that AAPA specifically describes using a totally serial process that is in direct contradict to a parallel process allegedly taught by Diem. In other words, AAPA teaches away from that of Diem and therefore may not be combined with Diem. In the meantime, according to MPEP 2142, “indsight” based upon Applicants’ disclosure cannot be used in making a *prima facie* case of obviousness rejection.

The Office Action further admits that neither AAPA nor Diem teaches a second logic means that inhibits the writing of a task in the field(s) of the FIFO memory where a valid task has been entered and enables the writing in the first free field below the pile, while contending that the above feature is obvious to one skilled in the art. Without conceding appropriateness of the alleged motivation of not overwriting valid entries, Applicants would like to point out that the Office Action failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the distinctive feature of “enable said writing in the first free field below in the pile” of independent claim 1.

In view of all the deficiencies as discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 of the present invention is patentable over alleged AAPA and prior art Diem.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and thus include all the distinguishing elements of claim 1, as described above, as well as other distinct features and elements. Claims 2-6 are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with regard to claim 1.

In view of above, Applicants respectfully request rejections of claims 1-6 under

35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the preceding remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with this paper. However, if there is any such fee due, please charge any such fee to the deposit account No. 09-0458.

Respectfully submitted,

/Yuanmin Cai/

---

Yuanmin Cai, Ph.D.  
Agent for Applicants  
Registration No. 56,513

Dated: January 7, 2008

**INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION**

Intellectual Property Law Department, East Fishkill  
2070 Route 52, Bldg-321, Zip-482  
Hopewell Junction, NY 12533  
Tel: (845) 894-8469  
Fax: (845) 892-6363